

Existentialism, Authenticity and Modern Debates Over Incapable Individuals

Runyang Zhou *

Saint Mary's High School, 5648 N. El Dorado Street Stockton, CA 95207, United States

* Corresponding Author zhou2772208244@gmail.com

Abstract. This study offers a comprehensive explanation of Sartre's existentialist vision of man's true nature and the concept of freedom in terms of the cognitive categories, moral responsibility, and intelligibility of behaviour of the modern individual. Specifically, the study focuses on the modern individual. It attempts to present some dilemmas about freedom and individual behaviour in the form of a history of ideas by echoing each other with some intellectual traditions and currents of modernity that are closely related to one another. For the purpose of concentrating the work of this study, a number of comparative approaches to the history of philosophy have been selected. These approaches, in particular those that are founded on action analysis and social contextualization, have been selected. By utilising these comparisons, the purpose of this study is to attempt to uncover some theoretical conundrums concerning freedom that are associated with the existentialist or humanist system of thought, as well as to propose theoretical reflections that correspond to these concerns. The clues that are sorted out in this article will be of great assistance in the future when attempts are made to be successful in completing the numerous tasks of theoretical advancement work that fall under the concept of freedom in traditional continental philosophy.

Keywords: Authenticity; Existentialism; Jean-Paul Sartre.

1. Introduction

This study does not aim to be groundbreaking or revolutionary, but rather seeks to provide a precise and concise description of Sartre's existentialist understanding of authenticity and freedom. Its purpose is to present enough information for readers to truly comprehend Sartre's conception of authenticity and freedom. This research aims to elucidate Sartre's definition of existentialism and explore the potential shortcomings that may arise when examining it from a personal perspective. Completing all of these tasks would require a lengthy endeavour. However, this journey is somewhat straightforward because individuals often struggle to effectively articulate their thoughts during debates, and articles may fail to directly address the fundamental philosophical enigma or situation. Therefore, the overall objective is to employ the simplest possible expression.

In order to engage in philosophical inquiry, the language puzzle should be approached from a metaphysical perspective, using a priori reasoning. The philosophical meta-language, often referred to as an idealistic utopian existence, is the subject of this research. The aim is to strive towards that idealistic state while also addressing the significant linguistic shift introduced by Heidegger. The revolutionary nature of Sartre's existentialist philosophy lies in the fact that he elevated the position of humanism to a higher position in the philosophy of mankind at that time, and completely shattered the old metaphysics of Hegel and Schelling's existentialism, but his shortcoming lies in the fact that he has not yet jumped out of the framework of that idealism, so his negativity has not yet arrived at a complete negativity, and has the limitations due to his time and cognition of incomplete fields [1, 2]. These limitations of the times, and his cognition of fields would serve the purpose of a modern version of humanism in a holistic picture.

The thought of existentialism has not yet reached the point where materialism has completely rejected it. Its definition of the subject's metaphysical framework of the Dasein is similar to that of Heidegger's [3, 4]. Their ontological definitions of the subject are that the subject is a kind of problematic consciousness. In other words, the subject is free indeed but, free of ignorance. That special feature

is based upon a series of facts namely, that because of his freedom, that the subject is exempted from the world's definition of semiotic hierarchy, and he is not in the field's generated state of things, so that the subject can break the rigid semiotic mechanisms of the field as something outside of the Absolute, in other words, the subject is the only being outside of the Absolute who can touch the authority of it. To proceed from this rebellious notion of rationalism, he further claims that the subject is the only being in the world who can create another brand-new semiotics system. But all this does not come from the freedom of the subject but from the ignorance of the subject, who knows the existence of the hierarchy of the field but does not know where he is. He knows that the field hierarchy exists, but he does not know where he is or whether he is within it, and because of this being, he does not know the relationship between the human being and the world's genesis, he does not know that the original will is laying down the field's original semiotic hierarchy. Neither does he know that he is the only one who can create another new semiotic system. The subject is, in Sartre's phrase, the absolute relation between the mediator and his mediator. Leninism, which perceives the field with a kind of nihilistic negativity, as if the existence of a Creator or a God is meaningless to us, and the real question is how we are to live and what we are to do in the future, as in Sartre's perhaps best-known phrase, "Being precedes essence," and how essences are not created by others but are constructed by Being itself, without the need for anyone or a Creator to do anything about it. It is not created by others, but constructed by the being itself, without the need for anyone or a Creator to make it so or confine it.

2. Basic Concepts and the Core Notions of Sartre's Authenticity

Before understanding Sartre's philosophical system again it is necessary to understand a few basic concepts. The first is his definition of freedom, which Sartre believes is absolute for all, from the lowliest prisoner to the noblest aristocracy, but people will shackle their freedom with self-deception. Self-deception refers to paralyzing making choices by telling oneself that one does not in fact have subjectivity or that the subjectivity of the Other is greater than that of the Other to give oneself [1, 5]. The anxiety that comes with it, like complaining to people that you never have a choice or you're being held hostage whole life by social norms.

What is a subject with authenticity? In the view of this article, the most important factor for a subject with authenticity is to control or understand everything in the cognitive world, and what this research mean by the term cognitive world is the knowledge of the cognition of the world, the conjecture of the construction of the world, and other factors that constitute the worldview, as Kant said that human beings cannot know anything beyond cognition. Since human beings are unable to perceive things outside of their cognition, so everything within their cognition can be referred to as temporal reality if the subject is able to control or explain it, because cognition changes all the time. The standard of what can be achieved to be true is also changing all the time [2].

In addition, this article prefers the definition of authenticity that has a Hegelian dialectical thinking in which the subject should have the ability to observe and understand the influence of everything within the cognizable and comprehensible range. It is crucial to mention that this process is a dialectical movement because first of all, man cannot cognize all the knowledge or history. Man is defective, but each person carries out the dialectical movement (labor and reading, etc.) to achieve what Nietzsche called the super-man. Those processes are all different, because when you succeed in reaching the end maybe you don't have the same path but you end up reaching the destination of "absolute knowledge", which is the same and identical. This could be perceived just as the meaning of a worker's philosophy of life may be exactly the same as that of a scholar's philosophy of life, except that the former is bold and vulgar. The words used may be even more vulgar, as in a passage of plain propaganda, the power is in the people, the same meaning is conveyed as the doctrine of Maxism.

There are several cores of what Sartre says about how to be an authentic subject. The first is to understand that the subject is responsible for the consequences of his own choices (action/agir), in

other words, to understand the choices he has made. The choices and some of the consequences are your responsibility and you're responsible for them.

2.1. Responsibility of actions

As Sartre mentions in *Being and Nothingness*, when Constantine the Great founded Constantinople, his intention was to build a palace in the east of Rome [6]. Of course, Constantine the Great was responsible for this, but the act of founding Constantinople had other consequences, such as contributing to the breakup of Rome and the creation of the Eastern Roman Empire, for which Constantine the Great is not responsible because he made the decision in the absence of a clear and precise definition of what was meant by "the East" and "the West".

The lack of it will inevitably make it happen yet no one can predict it so people should be held accountable for their actions but not all of them. Because the subject has freedom of choice, all decisions made by the subject, even if he is aware of them or not, are freely made by him. Facing whole of this, of course, it is liable.

2.2. Consequences of Choices

Two follows one When you make choices you need to be able to identify or do your best to recognize the consequences of the choices you make while the time is running the whole story to its end. And you're willing to take it. Although Sartre argues that as a subject you cannot predict the consequences of your actions, just as when you throw a ball you may know where it will go when you throw it but you cannot predict the consequences it will have, as a real subject you can't predict the consequences of your actions.

One needs to do one's best to find out what the consequences might be, and if one can't perhaps one should consider whether or not the decision should be made. As Sartre's most well-known sentence says, "existence precedes essence", he believes that only when an existent exists can he pursue his essence, just as the ball was thrown by the subject, in Sartre's view, only when a human being does the act of throwing out the ball, only when this act first exists can he possess its meaning or essence, that is, what he will cause, but I, as the existent, am the one who makes this act possible. But I, as an existent being, am the one who makes the ball. A thrown ball exists where I naturally have some control over its future.

People are like gods at this point, they can create a landscape or an event but they can't predict what will happen afterward, just as God didn't know that Adam and Eve would be compelled, and that he would need to do a series of dialectical exercises in history to be able to achieve perhaps the results he had envisioned.

2.3. Cognition

It is decisive to understand themselves to have the ability to make choices, to have the ability to make all decisions about everything in the world that people now have within their cognitive capacity, or liberty.

Again, this chapter will give an example of an infant's freedom to make all the decisions within his cognitive capacity. The answer is yes, although the actions he can make are few, those actions are all the decisions he can make in his worldview, and as he grows older the subject matter of his cognition and ability to make decisions is more important. Growing its ability to make more and more decisions means having more and more freedom. It's like a teenager who has a conflict with his parents and decides to run away from home, and although he may not be able to survive, he still has the freedom to put aside the physical conditions, the subject always has a choice, he has the freedom to have all of those things that limit the choices that you can make, maybe from society, maybe from your parents, maybe from your parents, maybe from your parents, maybe from your parents. From the worldviews that make up the world but they are not the iron laws of the world you can always make free choices. When you are held hostage by the so-called social norms, your freedom is never restricted, and by

recognizing the social norms, you are sacrificing part of your power in exchange for the security that the other gives you, as if you were making a deal, and a real individual can see what the price on the scale is.

What can also see what they are about to give, and a non-authentic individual cannot do what is stated above. And his price tag is to be a person who is not absolutely free, or an acquiescence to the deprivation of your subjectivity by others. When the subject considers himself as not absolutely free, it is in fact the subject who freely derives this inference that he is not absolutely free, and the fact that he still has freedom just that he limits it with his own inferences, but he is still a man with absolute freedom. It is finally reached to the argument that a subject can only be called a real subject if all three of these conditions are met.

3. Reflections

Is it really impossible for people to be forced to make choices. The answer to the question of whether or not people can be persecuted is yes people can be persecuted but people don't get persecuted for choosing when you are persecuted by society as a whole. There will be an invisible hand pushing forward, but you can't see it. Anything that appears in front of you that you can touch may change, if only you have a choice to make.

Another question goes as should people really be responsible for all the decisions they make? When you make a decision you may not be able to see the consequences, or retribution, but when it really comes to you. You should be prepared and able to solve the consequences and when you can't solve the unexplained you need to know that everything comes from you are your own reasons. One can only blame his or herself, because it is you who made the decision and you should be blamed for your arrogance or your lack of discipline, or for the fact that the decision was made by you.

There is also the question of what kind of freedom can be called real freedom, and because of this Sartre's clear definition of freedom and his inaction in the face of most concrete problems, one wonders whether his definition of what freedom is somehow useless, or worse, whether his definition of freedom affects the value of freedom itself, or whether freedom itself should not be defined or cared about, and that freedom is real only in the absence of the very act of defining it. Perhaps freedom itself should not be defined or cared about, but only in the absence of the act of defining freedom itself is freedom real, and in this sense, as Sartre defines it, a certain attitude towards life can be called freedom, and any other gesture is not free or, in his words, untrue, and perhaps he is right, but does this interpreted and defined freedom evolve into a rigid dogma, where all those who try to go towards freedom are framed in a framework of the same kind of interpretations as Sartre's? Or does it evolve into a party of so-called "liberals" against those who don't follow the norms?

4. Conclusion

In Sartre's view, people have absolute freedom to make choices, but this also means that all subjects have absolute freedom, and when one subject makes an action, other subjects who benefit from it will join in, but at the same time there must be others whose interests are jeopardized, and this leads to a conflict, in which one side wins the conflict and its freedom is preserved, but the freedom of the others is jeopardized. All Others have absolute freedom so it will lead to maybe people's freedoms being restricted. Through the use of similar intellectual traditions and contemporary movements, this work aims to explore the complexities surrounding freedom and individual behaviour by examining the history of ideas. This study focuses on selected comparative approaches to the history of philosophy, particularly those that utilise action analysis and social contextualization. This study aims to uncover theoretical dilemmas surrounding the concept of freedom within the existentialist or humanist system of thought and propose corresponding theoretical reflections through these comparisons. Future endeavours to achieve various theoretical advancements in traditional continental philosophy will be enhanced by the insights elucidated in this article.

References

- [1] C. Howells, *Sartre: The necessity of freedom*. Cambridge University Press, (2009).
- [2] P. Poellner, Early Sartre on freedom and ethics. *European Journal of Philosophy*. 2015, pp. 221 - 47.
- [3] D. Detmer, Sartre on freedom and education. *Sartre Studies International*, 2005, pp.78 - 90.
- [4] I. Day, Being or nothingness: Indigeneity, antiblackness, and settler colonial critique. *Critical ethnic studies*, 2015, 1 (2), pp.102 - 121.
- [5] J. P. Sartre, *Jean-Paul Sartre: Basic Writings*. Psychology Press, (2001).
- [6] J. P. Sartre, Being and nothingness. *Central Works of Philosophy v4: Twentieth Century: Moore to Popper*, 4, 2015, p.155.